

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	10.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,075		11/21/2001	Shunsuke Shuto	UNIU42.001AUS	1492
20995	7590	03/03/2004		EXAM	INER
KNOBB	E MART	ENS OLSON & I	KIELIN,	KIELIN, ERIK J	
2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
IRVINE,	IRVINE, CA 92614			2813	
				DATE MAILED: 03/03/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/990,075	SHUTO ET AL.				
Advisory Addion	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Erik Kielin	2813				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 11 February 2004 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Ap Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	o avoid abandonment of this appli r: (1) a timely filed amendment whi peal (with appeal fee); or (3) a tim	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in				
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing da b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire lat ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the result of the control of the co	f the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). Th have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of e 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the short (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than thre earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	xtension and the corresponding amount of the ened statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appells 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:					
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
<ul><li>(c)</li></ul>	on in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without car	nceling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s): The rejection under 35	<u>USC 112(1)</u> .				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ reques application in condition for allowance because		sidered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claim						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follo	ws:					
Claim(s) allowed: none.						
Claim(s) objected to: none.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,9 and 10</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>14-17</u> .						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a)	approved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State						
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
<u> </u>	•	Erik Kielin Primary Examiner				

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/990,075

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Requiring the liquid crystal polymer to be formed from the monomer units (a) and (b), as claimed in claim 1, as opposed to simply being a mixture as oroginally claimed by using the terminology "comprising" is a new issue. Applicant agrees that the liquid crystal polymer may be a mixture, as stated in the Response filed 11 February 2004 on page 6, first paragraph. Broadening the scope by removing "soley" is also a new issue.